



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/546,966	04/11/2000	David T. Pollock	ENDOV-51639	4186
24201 7590 06/25/2008 FULWIDER PATTON LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			EXAMINER BUI, VY Q	
			ART UNIT 3773	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09546966	4/11/2000	POLLOCK, DAVID T.	ENDOV-51639

FULWIDER PATTON LLP  
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER  
6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

## EXAMINER

Vy Q.. Bui

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3773

20080619

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

Commissioner for Patents

Dear Sir:

The Examiner regrets that it takes a long time for the "Supplemental Examiner's Answer" (1/25/2008) to be issued and sent to the Applicant because some of ineffective attempts of the Examiner during the appeal process, such as "Reply Brief" (paper 9/11/2006) and "Reply Brief" (paper 3/15/2007).

However, the most recent "Supplemental Examiner's Answer" (paper 1/25/2008) was substantially the same as "Reply Brief" (3/15/2007) issued earlier in response to the Applicant's "Supplemental Appeal Brief" (5/26/2006). Please notice that the same reference Drasler et al-6,245,101 has been applied for rejection since "Final Office Action" (6/23/2005).

Considering the time and effort, this case is a serious burden to the Examiner because the Examiner only has the same very limited time and resource for this present case as for other regular cases.

The Applicant's request to strike the "Supplemental Examiner's Answer" (1/25/2008) for the reason stated by the Applicant (page 2, paper 3/25/2008) certainly will undermine the evaluation of the patentability of the present claimed invention at least over Drasler et al-6,245,101.

The "Reply To The Supplemental Examiner's Answer" (3/25/2008) is acknowledged and the case is forwarded to the "Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences" for further consideration.

Respectfully,

/Vy Q. Bui/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3773